Meeting Notes		Department of Health SRDC IAQ 3 rd WG March 29, 2005			
Facilitator:	Tim Hardin			Note Taker(s):	Nancy Bernard Mark Soltman
Attendees:	Dave DeLong, TPCHD; Art Busch, WEA Mid-State; James Green, community; Scott LaBar, ESD 112; Mary Senn, student; Carly LaPlant, student, Paul Clark, Moses Lake SD, WAMOA; June Sine, WSSDA; Steve Main, SRHD; Eric Dickson, ESD 101; Mike Currie, Bainbridge Is. SD; Mark Cooper, parent; Thelma Simon, parent; Janice Doyle, SNOW,; Vern Enns, ; Bob Miksch, IEH; Claire Olsovsky, IEH; John Wolpers, Kittitas CHD, EHD; Daniel Salzer, community; Maria Mason, community; Denise Frasino, teacher; Carter Bagg, OSPI; Pete Keithly, ; Carol Jones, Peninsula SD; Don Leaf, WSEHA (late afternoon)				
Absent:	Brenda Hood, OSPI;		Guests:	Susan, Titus, EPA; O	Cathy Olaine

AGENDA ITEMS	DISCUSSION		
Introductions Review of minutes Review of Agenda	No additions or corrections to the minutes.		
ACTION			
Siting, p. 7	Siting A See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes.		
	 The workgroup discussed: The definition of an ESA The length of time an ESA may be valid. Whether a portable placement should or would trigger an ESA. Siting B See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes. The workgroup discussed: What triggers Phase 2 or 3 follow-up? Proposal B covers this. 		
ACTION	Vote A: Rule: G: 21 Y: 0 R: 0Guidance: G: Y: R: Not needed.Vote B: Rule: G: 21 Y: 0 R: 0Guidance: G; Y: R: Not needed.		
Design, p. 8	 Design A See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes. The workgroup discussed: The impact of the "green building" bill on this proposal. Will there be a method of exempting smaller districts without the financial means to implement this proposal. The purpose of the proposal, which is to promote "regionally" appropriate (e.g., no flat roofs). 		
ACTION	Vote A: Rule: G: 17 Y: 4 R: 0 Guidance: G: 5 Y: 10 R: 6		

AGENDA ITEMS	DISCUSSION		
Design, p. 9-10	Construction A See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes.		
	 The workgroup discussed: Language changes to the proposal. What size of a project would trigger a constructability review. Who is the party responsible for the CR. The need to have the building departments work in conjunction with the LHJ's to promote quality construction projects. That the intent of the review is to check documentation of the project. That this is a directive to the school districts to have the CR done. That the SRDC will place this proposal into the appropriate place in the rule. 		
ACTION	Vote A: Rule: G: 13 Y: 7 R: 1 Guidance: G: 10 Y: 6 R: 5		
Design, p. 9-10	Construction B See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes.		
	 Where in the process this should occur. What the current LHJ review process entails. The need for a pre-application meeting to coordinate efforts between building and health. That by the time commissioning occurs it is too late to address most of these concerns. Whether this is appropriate in guidance or rule How prescriptive this needs to be and if a checklist would help facilitate. Construction H See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes. The workgroup discussed: That the final work product may differ markedly from the drawings and that re-entrainment issues should also be checked after building to ensure that 		
ACTION	none exist. Pete Keithly joined group – 22 voters. Vote B: Rule: G: 7 Y: 3 R: 12 Guidance: G: 17 Y: 5 R: 0 Vote H: Rule: G: 16 Y: 5 R: 1 Guidance: G: 6 Y: 11 R: 5		
	Construction C See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes.		
	The workgroup discussed: The value of LHJ participation in the process. What capacity the LHJ's possess to review and comment.		
ACTION	Vote C: Rule: G: 18 Y: 4 R: 0 Guidance: G: 5 Y: 16 R: 1 Break for lunch.		
	Construction D See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes. No discussion.		
ACTION	Vote D: Rule: G: 22 Y: 0 R: 0 Guidance: G: Y: R: No vote.		
	Construction E See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes. The workgroup discussed: Modifications to the proposed language to clarify the events that would trigger this process. The need to be specific to HVAC related issues and not the building as a whole.		

AGENDA ITEMS	DISCUSSION		
ACTION	Vote E: Rule: G: 15 Y: 6 R: 1 (22 voters) Guidance: G: 7 Y: 5 R: 9 (21 voters)		
	Construction F See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes.		
	The workgroup discussed: That this is difficult for smaller districts to perform. The process that has been developed and implemented at OSPI. The distinction between the legal entity and the procedure. The lack of qualified personnel conducting CM.		
ACTION	Vote F: Rule: G: 15 Y: 3 R: 4 (22 voters) Guidance: G: 11 Y: 2 R: 9 Don Leaf joined, Paul Clark gone		
	Construction G See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes.		
	 The workgroup discussed: The purpose of the proposal. What is a cooperative review? The practical limitations of coordination between the building officials and LHJ's. What size of a project should trigger this? Are portables included in this process? 		
ACTION	Vote G: Rule: G: 9 Y: 3 R: 9 (21 voters) Guidance: G: 3 Y: 12 R: 6 Pete Keithly left. Break		
Mold, p. 15 - 18 Agenda adjustment	Mold A See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes.		
	 The workgroup discussed: Providing schools with DOH guidance to limit the exposure of sensitive individuals. Sensitivity, allergy, hypersensitivity and accommodation. The legal definition of accommodation in the ADA 504 process. Reasonable accommodation by districts usually informal process. Whether immediate is clearly understood and if notification is adequately addressed. Should notification include the media? EPA and NYC guidance is specific about these issues. Is cleaning and remediation adequately addressed? What size of an issue will trigger this response? 		
ACTION	Vote A: Rule: G: 12 Y: 5 R: 5 Guidance: G: 8 Y: 6 R: 8 Paul back, 22 voters		
	Mold B See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes.		
ACTION	Vote B: Rule: G: 21 Y: 1 R: 0 Guidance: G: 5 Y: 5 R: 12		

AGENDA ITEMS	DISCUSSION				
	Mold C See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes.				
	 The workgroup discussed: The proposed IAQ protocol and how it addresses some of these issues. A language modification that protects DOH from having to notify each individual. Is this a workable solution to the problem? 				
ACTION	Vote C: Rule: G: 13 Y: 8 R: 1 Guidance: G: 8 Y: 5 R: 9 22 voters, Paul back				
	Mold D See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes.				
	 The workgroup discussed: The definition of monitor. Brief discussion of testing and the problems associated with that approach. 				
ACTION	Vote D: Rule: G: 16 Y: 2 R: 4 Guidance: G: Y: R: Not necessary				
	Mold E See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes.				
ACTION	Vote E: Rule: G: 16 Y: 1 R: 5 Guidance: G: Y: R: Not necessary				
	Mold F See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes.				
ACTION	Vote F: Rule: G: 14 Y: 7 R: 1 Guidance: G: 6 Y: 6 R: 10				
	Mold G See decision agenda for full proposal text and changes.				
ACTION	Vote G: Rule: G: 12 Y: 8 R: 2 Guidance: G: 8 Y: 5 R: 9				
Н	ANDOUTS	NEXT MEETING			
-Building Commissioning Association document on commissioning -California's Dept. of Toxic Substances Control, Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Advisory -ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 55-2004 document of temperature & humidity -A Lesson in Constructability 101, Stephanie L. Dovichi, Pacific Program Management, Inc.		April 12, 2005, 9AM – 3 PM Lake Washington School District L. E. Scarr Resource Center			